Stochastic thermodynamics of quantum maps with and without equilibrium

Felipe Barra* and Cristóbal Lledó
Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias Físicas y Matemáticas, Universidad de Chile, Santiago Chile

We study stochastic thermodynamics for a quantum system of interest whose dynamics are described by a completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) map due to its interaction with a thermal bath. We define CPTP maps with equilibrium as CPTP maps with an invariant state such that the entropy production due to the action of the map on the invariant state vanishes. Thermal maps are a subgroup of CPTP maps with equilibrium. In general, for CPTP maps the thermodynamic quantities such as the entropy production or work performed on the system depend on the combined state of the system plus its environment. We show that these quantities can be written in term of system properties for maps with equilibrium. The relations we obtain are valid for arbitrary strength of the coupling between the system and the thermal bath. The fluctuations of thermodynamic quantities are considered in the framework of a two-point measurement scheme. We derive the fluctuation theorem for the entropy production for general maps and a fluctuation relation for the stochastic work on a system that starts in the Gibbs state. Some simplifications for the distributions in the case of maps with equilibrium are given. We illustrate our results considering spin 1/2 systems under thermal maps, non-thermal maps with equilibrium, maps with non-equilibrium steady states and concatenations of them.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 05.70.-a, 03.65.Yz 75.10.Pq

arXiv:1704.06029v1 [quant-ph] 20 Apr 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, experiments are on the edge of dealing with thermal machines where quantum mechanics should be relevant and thus issues such as the manifestations of non-classical features in their behavior and a proper thermodynamic formulation for quantum machines are currently under investigation [1]. For various systems of interest the interaction energy between the system and the environment can be neglected in comparison to the energy of the system and to the energy of the bath. In this case, a thermodynamic framework referred to as "in the weak coupling" is very successful [2, 3]. In particular, work is performed on the system by externally varying a control parameter of the system Hamiltonian, for instance by changing a field that raises an energy level of the system.

For other systems of interest one can engineer the coupling between the system and external probes, making it global or local and switching it on and off in a controlled way, see e.g. [4]. In this paper, we have in mind such a setup and with the purpose of studying thermodynamic processes, we consider the simple situation in which the external probe is prepared in a thermal state. The experimenter control the coupling at some work cost, and a certain amount of heat will also flow between the system and the probe. These thermodynamic quantities are in this case completely determined by the coupling energy. An appropriate formalism to analyze these quantum evolutions and the thermodynamic behavior is that of completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) maps [5]. In particular, One would like to account for the coupling between the system and the probe non-perturbatively. The thermodynamic properties of systems strongly coupled to a bath are not well understood although they have been considered in [6–9].

We study the quantum stochastic thermodynamics of CPTP maps as formulated in [9–11] where one consider that the system plus environment evolve unitarily during the process from an uncorrelated initial state and therefore the change in the system due to this process is given by a CPTP map. In this formulation, the strength of the coupling is arbitrary but the thermodynamic quantities such as the work performed on the system, the total heat exchange between the system and the bath and the total entropy production are non-local quantities, expressed in terms of the total system-bath density matrix at the beginning and end of the process. In the limit that the strength of the coupling vanishes one recovers the expressions obtained in the weak coupling [12–15] which are local, i.e., they depend only on system operators. In our study, we go beyond the analysis of averaged quantities and consider also their stochastic versions defined through a two-point measurement scheme [16]. This stochastic thermodynamics relies on the concept of stochastic trajectory. The thermodynamic quantities are defined for every trajectory in such a way that upon averaging the standard definitions for the mean quantities are recovered. Fluctuation theorems reveal statistical properties of these quantities for arbitrary non-equilibrium processes [17–23] and they have been established for classical Hamiltonian or stochastic systems [17, 19], isolated quantum systems [24–27] and for some

* fbarra@dfi.uchile.cl

CPTP maps [5, 11, 28] representing a system driven by a time dependent protocol. Here we derive these equalities but emphasize a process driven by the controlled interaction with the bath.

A process may involve several interactions with the bath and thus a sequence of different maps may act on the system. In particular, repeating the same sequence may bring the system to a stationary or invariant state. In general, an invariant state of a CPTP map, represent a non-equilibrium steady state (NESS) in the sense that the entropy production due to the action of the map over the state is strictly positive. We call them *maps with NESS*. We define *maps with equilibrium* as maps such that the entropy production associated to the action of the map on the invariant state vanishes. We will be more specific later. From the point of view of thermodynamics, maps with equilibrium have the interesting property that the thermodynamic quantities depend only on system properties even in the strong coupling regime. These maps generalize thermal maps and they are related to the existence of conserved quantities. We obtain analytical expressions for the thermodynamic quantities and, in particular situations, for the stochastic quantities. We illustrate the relevance of our results in spin 1/2 systems under the evolution of a thermal map, a non-thermal map with equilibrium and maps with non-equilibrium steady states.

The article is organized as follows. In section II we introduce stochastic thermodynamics for CPTP maps, we define CPTP maps with equilibrium and study its main properties and then we prove a fluctuation theorem for the entropy production and a work fluctuation theorem similar to the Crooks fluctuation theorem [20] for CPTP maps with and without equilibrium. In section III we apply our results to spin 1/2 systems. We conclude in section IV.

II. STOCHASTIC THERMODYNAMICS FOR COMPLETELY POSITIVE TRACE PRESERVING MAPS

In this section we present the main results of stochastic thermodynamics for an open quantum system whose dynamics is controlled by a CPTP map. Consider a system and a bath whose joined evolution is governed by the unitary $U = \mathrm{T}e^{-i\int_0^\tau (H_S(t)+H_B+V(t))dt}$ with $\mathrm{T}e$ the time ordering of the exponential. The Hamiltonian H_B of the heat bath is constant in time. The coupling between the system and the bath is represented by an interaction energy $V(t)$ that vanishes for $t<0$ ant $t>\tau$. During the joined evolution, the system can be driven in a cycle, i.e., its Hamiltonian may be time dependent $H_S(t)$ but $H_S(0)=H_S(\tau)=H_S$. We consider this condition because we are interested in systems with an invariant state and a system arbitrarily driven, generically will not have it. Later we will consider examples with constant Hamiltonian. We assume that H_B and H_S are non-degenerate. The eigenstates of the system are in $\mathcal{H}_S$ and those of the heat bath in $\mathcal{H}_B$. Initially, at time $t=0$, the system and bath are uncoupled, i.e., $\rho_{\rm tot}=\rho_S\otimes\omega_\beta(H_B)$, with $\omega_\beta(H_B)=\frac{e^{-\beta H_B}}{Z_B}$ where β is the inverse temperature of the bath and $Z_B=\mathrm{Tr}e^{-\beta H_B}$. Then the system and bath are coupled for a lapse of time τ and the initial state $\rho_{\rm tot}$ in $\mathcal{H}_S\otimes\mathcal{H}_B$ changes to a new state

$$\rho'_{\rm tot}=U\left(\rho_S\otimes\omega_\beta(H_B)\right)U^\dagger. \tag{1}$$

In the following, we denote $\rho'_S=\mathrm{Tr}_B\rho'_{\rm tot}$ and $\rho'_B=\mathrm{Tr}_S\rho'_{\rm tot}$, where Tr_X is the partial trace over subsystem X. Tracing out the bath one obtains a completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) map $\mathcal{E}$ for the system evolution

$$\rho'_S=\mathcal{E}(\rho_S)=\mathrm{Tr}_B\left[U\left(\rho_S\otimes\omega_\beta(H_B)\right)U^\dagger\right]=\sum_{ij}M_{ij}\rho_S M_{ij}^\dagger \tag{2}$$

with Kraus operators

$$M_{ij}=\sqrt{\frac{e^{-\beta\varepsilon_i}}{Z_B}}\langle j|U|i\rangle. \tag{3}$$

Here $|i\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$ are eigenstates of the Hamiltonian of the bath H_B with eigenvalues ε_i and ε_j respectively. Note that as required for the trace preservation of $\mathcal{E}$

$$\sum_{ij}M_{ij}^\dagger M_{ij}=\sum_i\frac{e^{-\beta\varepsilon_i}}{Z_B}\langle i|U^\dagger\sum_j|j\rangle\langle j|U|i\rangle=\sum_i\frac{e^{-\beta\varepsilon_i}}{Z_B}\langle i|I_S\otimes I_B|i\rangle=I_S.$$

As is well known there are many choices for the set of Kraus operators M_{ij} that produce the same map $\mathcal{E}$. This particular representation provides a relation between the evolution of the system with the changes in the environment. The quantum operation $M_{ij}\rho_S M_{ij}^\dagger$ gives the change in the system associated to the transition $|i\rangle\to|j\rangle$ in the bath. We define and study for a single map the relevant quantities for stochastic thermodynamics. This will be generalized later for sequences of maps.

A. quantum trajectories

In the context of stochastic thermodynamics one introduces the fluctuating quantities as the result of a two-point measurement [16]. Initially, with the system in an arbitrary state ρ_S, a nonselective projective measurement of a non-degenerate system operator A is performed leaving the system in the state $\bar{\rho}_S = \sum p_i(n)|a_n\rangle\langle a_n|$ with $p_i(n) = \mathrm{Tr}_S(|a_n\rangle\langle a_n|\rho_S)$. Also the energy H_B is measured on the bath that was in a thermal state leaving it in the state $|i\rangle\langle i|$ with probability $e^{-\beta\epsilon_i}/Z_B$. The uncorrelated state $\bar{\rho}_S \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|$ evolves unitarily and at the end of the process the bath Hamiltonian H_B is measured again. The bath is then left in a state $|j\rangle\langle j|$. The pair $k = (ij)$ identify a Krauss operator M_{ij} and one can see that the probability of measuring the bath energies ε_i initially and ε_j finally is given by $p_k(\bar{\rho}_S) = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{E}_k(\bar{\rho}_S)]$, where $\mathcal{E}_k(\cdot) \equiv M_k \cdot M_k^\dagger$. Thus if one is concerned with the system one can say that during its evolution one of the operations $\mathcal{E}_k(\cdot)$ occurs with probability $p_k(\bar{\rho}_S)$ but if no register is kept of the value k, the final state is $\rho'_S = \sum p_k(\bar{\rho}_S)\rho'_k = \mathcal{E}(\bar{\rho}_S)$ with $\rho'_k = \mathcal{E}_k(\bar{\rho}_S)/p_k(\bar{\rho}_S)$. Also, at the end of the process a nonselective projective measurement of another non-degenerate system operator B is performed and finally the system is in a state $\bar{\rho}'_S = \sum p_f(n)|b_n\rangle\langle b_n|$ with $p_f(n) = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{E}(\bar{\rho}_S)|b_n\rangle\langle b_n|]$. A *trajectory* is defined as the sequence of values a_n, k, b_m and is denoted $\gamma = \{n, k, m\}$. Its probability $p(\gamma) = p(m, k|n)p_i(n)$ is the probability of measuring b_m after the operation $\mathcal{E}_k$ occurs, given that the system was initially in the state $|a_n\rangle\langle a_n|$ times the probability of the latter, i.e.,

$$p(\gamma) = |\langle b_m|M_k|a_n\rangle|^2 p_i(n). \tag{4}$$

Note that $\sum_{k,n} p(m, k|n)p_i(n) = p_f(m)$. More explicitly, with the expression in Eq.(3) for the Kraus operators, the probability of a trajectory $\gamma = \{n, k, m\} = \{n, (ij), m\} = \{n, i; m, j\}$ is according to Eq.(4)

$$p(\gamma) = |\langle j, b_m|U|i, a_n\rangle|^2 \frac{e^{-\beta\varepsilon_i}}{Z_B} p_i(n). \tag{5}$$

B. stochastic thermodynamics

In the previous subsection we obtained the probability $p(\gamma)$ of the quantum trajectory γ for a quantum system interacting with a bath. Now we associate the stochastic thermodynamic quantities for these trajectories.

If one measures the energy at the beginning and at the end of the process, i.e., $A = B = H_S$, we have the stochastic system energy change $\Delta e_\gamma = \epsilon_m - \epsilon_n$. Here ϵ_n denotes the eigenvalue of H_S associated to the eigenvector $|\epsilon_n\rangle$ and in this case $|a_n\rangle = |b_n\rangle = |\epsilon_n\rangle$. The stochastic heat flow to the system q_γ associated to the trajectory γ corresponds to the negative energy change of the environment and we assume that it is obtained from the knowledge of k. Indeed, the trajectory $\gamma = \{n, k, m\} = \{n, i; m, j\}$, with probability given in Eq.(5), represents the transition $|i\rangle \to |j\rangle$ in the bath whose energy change $\varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_i$ is minus the stochastic heat flow to the system, i.e., $q_\gamma = \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j$. According to the first law of stochastic thermodynamics, the stochastic work is given by

$$w_\gamma = \Delta e_\gamma - q_\gamma. \tag{6}$$

These fluctuating quantities will be one of our main concerns and will be studied trough their distribution, for instance for heat and work

$$p(q) = \sum_\gamma \delta(q - q_\gamma)p(\gamma), \quad p(w) = \sum_\gamma \delta(w - w_\gamma)p(\gamma). \tag{7}$$

Defining the averages over the trajectories $\Delta E = \sum_\gamma \Delta e_\gamma p(\gamma)$, $Q = \sum_\gamma q_\gamma p(\gamma)$ and $W = \sum_\gamma w_\gamma p(\gamma)$, one gets

$$\Delta E = \mathrm{Tr}[H_S(\bar{\rho}'_S - \bar{\rho}_S)] = \mathrm{Tr}[H_S(\rho'_S - \rho_S)] \tag{8}$$

$$Q = \mathrm{Tr}[H_B(\omega_\beta(H_B) - \rho'_B)] \tag{9}$$

and

$$W = \mathrm{Tr}[(H_S + H_B)(\rho'_{\mathrm{tot}} - \rho_{\mathrm{tot}})], \tag{10}$$

satisfying the first law $\Delta E = W + Q$.

Although, highly non-trivial from an experimental point of view, if one measures the density matrices, i.e., $A = \rho_S$ and $B = \rho'_S$, given in Eq.(2), one obtains the stochastic entropy change $\Delta s_\gamma = -\ln p_f(m) + \ln p_i(n)$. Note that in

this case $\bar{\rho}_S = \rho_S$ and $\bar{\rho}'_S = \rho'_S$. As the environment consist of a heat-bath with inverse temperature β, the stochastic entropy flow βq_γ and the entropy change Δs_γ define the stochastic entropy production

$$\Delta_i s_\gamma = \Delta s_\gamma - \beta q_\gamma. \tag{11}$$

This fluctuating quantity will be also of our main concerns and will be studied trough the entropy production distribution

$$p(\Delta_i s) = \sum_\gamma \delta(\Delta_i s - \Delta_i s_\gamma) p(\gamma). \tag{12}$$

These definitions are such that averaged over the trajectories one gets $\Delta_i S \equiv \sum_\gamma \Delta_i s_\gamma p(\gamma) = \Delta S - \beta Q$ with

$$\Delta S = -\mathrm{Tr}[\rho'_S \ln \rho'_S] + \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_S \ln \rho_S] \tag{13}$$

the von Neumann entropy change, Q given in Eq.(9) and

$$\Delta_i S = D(\rho'_{\mathrm{tot}} || \rho'_S \otimes \omega_\beta(H_B)) \geq 0 \tag{14}$$

for the averaged entropy production, where $D(a||b) = \mathrm{Tr}[a \ln a] - \mathrm{Tr}[a \ln b]$. These averaged expressions are valid beyond the two-point measurement scheme that we consider here and were obtained first in [9]. Therefore we consider that for a process $\rho_S \to \rho'_S = \mathcal{E}(\rho_S)$, the averages satisfy simultaneously $\Delta E = W + Q$ and $\Delta_i S = \Delta S - \beta Q$ with the quantities given in Eqs.(8,9,10,13,14) although the fluctuations of entropy production and work can be studied simultaneously only if $[H_S, \rho_S] = [H_S, \rho'_S] = 0$. Note that for their evaluation, in particular for the work Eq.(10) and entropy production Eq.(14) we need to know the full state ρ'_{tot}. In contrast, in the weak coupling limit where $V(t)$ can be neglected in comparison to H_S and H_B the thermodynamic quantities depend only on the states ρ'_S and ρ_S of the system of interest. We will show below, that this simplification can occur for the strongly coupled systems defined below.

C. maps with thermodynamic equilibrium

Let us assume that the map $\mathcal{E}$ has an attractive invariant state π defined as $\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^N(\rho_S) = \pi \ \forall \rho_S$ and $\pi = \mathcal{E}(\pi)$. An invariant state is thermodynamically characterized by $\Delta S = 0 = \Delta E$ as one can see from Eq.(8) and Eq.(13). We will say that this invariant state is an *equilibrium state* if $\Delta_i S = 0$, i.e., if the entropy production, Eq.(14), by the action of $\mathcal{E}$ on π vanishes. Maps with these special states are called maps with equilibrium. If the entropy produced by the action of the map $\mathcal{E}$ on π gives $\Delta_i S > 0$ we say that the invariant state is a non-equilibrium state. In this case one gets that $Q = -\beta^{-1}\Delta_i S < 0$ and $W = \beta^{-1}\Delta_i S > 0$ and thus the non-equilibrium state is sustained by the work performed by an external agent implementing the map on the system that is dissipated as heat. In this situation we say that $\mathcal{E}$ is a map with NESS.

According to Eq.(14) $\Delta_i S = 0$ for the steady state π if an only if $\pi \otimes \omega_\beta(H_B) = U\left(\pi \otimes \omega_\beta(H_B)\right) U^\dagger$. Equivalently, if the unitary U in Eq.(1) satisfies $[U, H_0 + H_B] = 0$, with H_0 an operator in the Hilbert space of the system $\mathcal{H}_S$, the product state $\omega_\beta(H_0) \otimes \omega_\beta(H_B)$, with $\omega_\beta(H_0) = \frac{e^{-\beta H_0}}{Z_0}$ where $Z_0 = \mathrm{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_0}]$, is invariant under the unitary evolution in Eq.(1) and $\omega_\beta(H_0)$ is an equilibrium state for the map in Eq.(2).

It follows from $[U, H_0 + H_B] = 0$ that

$$Q = \mathrm{Tr}[H_B(\omega_\beta(H_B) - \rho'_B)] = \mathrm{Tr}[H_0(\rho'_S - \rho_S)]. \tag{15}$$

Thus for maps with equilibrium the average work Eq.(10) simplifies to

$$W = \mathrm{Tr}_S[(H_S - H_0)(\rho'_S - \rho_S)] \tag{16}$$

which is determined by the system state only.

When the map has an equilibrium state $\omega_\beta(H_0)$ the entropy production also reduces to an expression that does not involve the state of the bath. Indeed, expanding Eq.(14)

$$\Delta_i S = D(\rho'_{\mathrm{tot}} || \rho'_S \otimes \omega_\beta(H_B)) = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho'_{\mathrm{tot}} \ln \rho'_{\mathrm{tot}}] - \mathrm{Tr}[\rho'_S \ln \rho'_S] - \mathrm{Tr}[\rho'_B \ln \omega_\beta(H_B)],$$

using the invariance of the von Neumann entropy under unitary transformations

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\rho'_{\mathrm{tot}} \ln \rho'_{\mathrm{tot}}] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_{\mathrm{tot}} \ln \rho_{\mathrm{tot}}] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_S \ln \rho_S] + \mathrm{Tr}[\omega_\beta(H_B) \ln \omega_\beta(H_B)]$$

together with Eq.(15), we obtain $\Delta_i S = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_S \ln \rho_S] - \mathrm{Tr}[\rho'_S \ln \rho'_S] - \mathrm{Tr}[(\rho_S - \rho'_S) \ln \omega_\beta(H_0)]$ which rearranged is

$$\Delta_i S = D(\rho_S || \omega_\beta(H_0)) - D(\rho'_S || \omega_\beta(H_0)) \tag{17}$$

which is positive due to the contracting character of the map [12]. Note that Eqs.(15), (16) and (17) are exact for maps with an equilibrium state and does not need a weak coupling ($V(t)$ small) condition to be satisfied.

Let us consider in further detail two particular cases of interest:

i) Stochastic thermodynamics of thermal maps: If $H_0 = H_S$ the map is called thermal [29–32]. Thermal maps have for equilibrium state the Gibbs thermal state $\omega_\beta(H_S) = e^{-\beta H_S}/Z_S$ with $Z_S = \mathrm{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_S}]$. For thermal maps the average work vanishes for every initial state ρ_S as follows from Eq.(16). Because thermal maps do not required an external agent that performs or extract work from the system they are supposed to describe the passive coupling between a system and a heat-bath. If a thermal map brings the system to the equilibrium Gibbs state, the entropy production Eq.(17) reduces to a well known expression [33] $\Delta_i S = D(\rho_S || \omega_\beta(H_S))$. This is the dissipation that occurs in the relaxation process $\rho_S \to \omega_\beta(H_S)$.

Let us now discuss the work fluctuations. Consider an energy measurement H_S at the beginning and at the end of a process realized by a thermal map. From $[U, H_S + H_B] = 0$ it follows that if the transition is possible ($p(\gamma) \sim |\langle \epsilon_m j|U|\epsilon_n i\rangle|^2 \neq 0$) it conserves the energy $\epsilon_m + \varepsilon_j = \epsilon_n + \varepsilon_i$. Therefore, for a thermal map Eq.(6) gives $w_\gamma = 0$ for any trajectory γ with $p(\gamma) \neq 0$ and for any initial state ρ_S.

To end these considerations about thermal maps, consider now, that the initial state of the system is the equilibrium state $\rho_S = \rho'_S = \omega_\beta(H_S)$ and thus the total system is in the invariant product state, $\rho'_{\mathrm{tot}} = \omega_\beta(H_S) \otimes \omega_\beta(H_B)$, of the total unitary evolution. Then, according to Eq.(17) the average entropy production vanishes, $\Delta_i S = 0$, as well as the fluctuations $\Delta_i s_\gamma = 0$ since $\Delta s_\gamma = \beta \Delta e_\gamma$, $q_\gamma = \Delta e_\gamma$ and $w_\gamma = 0$, see Eq.(11) and the paragraph above. Thus, for thermal maps in the equilibrium state, there are neither work nor entropy production fluctuations. They can be considered simultaneously because $[H_S, \omega_\beta(H_S)] = 0$.

ii) Stochastic thermodynamics of non-thermal maps with equilibrium:

We consider maps with an equilibrium state $\omega_\beta(H_0)$ with $H_0 \neq H_S$ but restrict ourselves to the particular situation in which $[H_0, H_S] = 0$. This is the situation we will encounter in the examples and we argue that it will often be the case if the system Hamiltonian is constant during the evolution, i.e., $H_S(t) = H_S \, \forall t$ and the coupling is a step function, i.e., $V(t) = V_{\mathrm{loc}}$ if $0 < t < \tau$ and $V(t) = 0$ elsewhere. Indeed in this case one finds that the equilibrium condition $[U, H_0 + H_B] = 0$ implies that $[H_S, H_0] = 0$ with the exception of some very particular cases in which $[V, H_0 + H_B] = [H_0, H_S] \otimes \mathbb{1}_B$. Anyhow, if $[H_0, H_S] = 0$ the first interesting observation is that one can manipulate Eq.(17) and rewrite it as

$$\Delta_i S = D(\rho_S || \omega_\beta(H_S)) - D(\rho'_S || \omega_\beta(H_S)) + \beta W$$

with W given in Eq.(16). This expression coincides with one derived in [33] on thermodynamical grounds for a system weakly coupled to a bath if applied to a cyclic process ($H_S(0) = H_S(\tau) = H_S$) as those we consider. Interestingly if $[H_0, H_S] = 0$, the work fluctuations becomes also a system property, i.e., one does not need to perform a measurement in the bath. Indeed let us consider the work distribution Eq.(7). Since $[H_0, H_S] = 0$ and H_S is non-degenerated, $|\epsilon_n\rangle$ is also an eigenvector of H_0, i.e., $H_0 |\epsilon_n\rangle = \epsilon_n^0 |\epsilon_n\rangle$. Then, from the equilibrium property $[U, H_0 + H_B] = 0$, one finds $\epsilon_m^0 + \varepsilon_j = \epsilon_n^0 + \varepsilon_i$ if $|\langle \epsilon_m, j|U|\epsilon_n, i\rangle|^2 \neq 0$, which is proportional to $p(\gamma)$ in Eq.(7). Therefore one is allowed to replace the stochastic work Eq.(6) inside the delta function by $w_\gamma = \epsilon_m - \epsilon_m^0 - (\epsilon_n - \epsilon_n^0)$ obtaining

$$p(w) = \sum_{n,m} \delta(w - [(\epsilon_m - \epsilon_m^0) - (\epsilon_n - \epsilon_n^0)]) \sum_{ij} |\, \langle \epsilon_m, j|\, U \,|\epsilon_n, i\rangle \,|^2 \frac{e^{-\beta \varepsilon_i}}{Z_B} p_i(n)$$

which is

$$p(w) = \sum_{n,m} \delta(w - [(\epsilon_m - \epsilon_m^0) - (\epsilon_n - \epsilon_n^0)]) \, \langle \epsilon_m|\, \mathcal{E}(|\epsilon_n\rangle \langle \epsilon_n|) \, |\epsilon_m\rangle \, p_i(n),$$

completely determined by system quantities and the map $\mathcal{E}$ without the need of measuring the bath. Averaging w with this expression we recover an expression apparently different from Eq.(16), namely $\mathrm{Tr}[(H_S - H_0)(\rho'_S - \bar{\rho}_S)]$. However, since the non-selectively measured $\bar{\rho}_S$ is diagonal in the eigenbasis of H_S (and H_0) then it is the same as Eq.(16). Note that as we are considering $[H_S, H_0] = 0$ it is always possible to write $H_S = H_0 + H_I$ with $[H_0, H_I] = 0$. This will be the case of the spin systems and thermodynamic cyclic process discussed later on. The eigenstates of H_S are also eigenstates of H_0 and of H_I and the eigenvalues are related by $\epsilon_n = \epsilon_n^0 + \alpha_n$ with ϵ_n^0 and α_n the eigenvalue of H_0 and H_I, respectively. The stochastic work, Eq.(6), is $w_\gamma = \alpha_m - \alpha_n$ and its average, Eq.(16), is $W = \mathrm{Tr}_S[H_I(\rho'_S - \rho_S)]$.

Moreover, because H_S and H_0 share an eigenbasis we can study simultaneously the work and entropy production fluctuations in the equilibrium state. One finds here that $p(\Delta_i s) = \delta(\Delta_i s)$. In fact, using a similar argument as the one used for the work distribution one can replace $\Delta_i s_\gamma$ by $\ln p_i(n) - \ln p_f(m) - \beta(\epsilon^0_m - \epsilon^0_n)$ inside the delta function in Eq.(12). But because $p_i(n) = e^{-\beta\epsilon^0_n}/Z_0$ and $p_f(m) = e^{-\beta\epsilon^0_m}/Z_0$ one gets $p(\Delta_i s) = \delta(\Delta_i s)$. Thus, if $[H_0, H_S] = 0$, in the equilibrium state we have that the work may fluctuate $p(w) \neq \delta(w)$ (although $W = 0$) but the entropy production does not fluctuate.

Let us summarize the results of this subsection. For a map with an equilibrium state the thermodynamic average quantities can be written in terms of properties of the system of interest only. In general, an active external agent has to provide (or extract) work to perform the map on a state ρ_S. Only for thermal maps $W = 0$ and the agent is passive. If the system is in the equilibrium state $\omega_\beta(H_0)$, the map can be performed with $W = 0$, see Eq.(16) and $\Delta_i S = 0$. In this equilibrium state the entropy production does not fluctuate $p(\Delta_i s) = \delta(\Delta_i s)$ but the work may still present fluctuations $p(w) \neq \delta(w)$ except for thermal maps. In the general case of a map with equilibrium in which $[H_0, H_S] \neq 0$ we cannot speak simultaneously about work and entropy production fluctuations. If we consider the latter we still have that in the equilibrium state the entropy production is a non-fluctuating quantity. This can also be obtained as a consequence of the integral fluctuation theorem as we will see below.

D. Fluctuation Theorems for the Entropy Production

A central result from stochastic thermodynamics is the detailed fluctuation theorem for the stochastic entropy production $\Delta_i s$. Consider the probability distribution Eq.(12) of a given $\Delta_i s$ value obtained according to the $A = \rho_S$ and $B = \rho'_S$ two-point measurement procedure. The detailed fluctuation theorem for the entropy production is

$$\ln \frac{p(\Delta_i s)}{\tilde{p}(-\Delta_i s)} = \Delta_i s, \tag{18}$$

where $\tilde{p}(\Delta_i s)$ refers to the distribution of the entropy production in a reverse process to be specified later. This equality is derived from the time reversal properties of the system. For the type of systems we study it was derived in [11] for driven Hamiltonians. Here we derive it to emphasize that the fluctuation theorem is also valid for systems driven by other mechanisms for instance by the coupling to the bath.

The time reversal operator [34] Θ is anti-unitary, i.e., $\Theta i = -i\Theta$, $\Theta^\dagger = \Theta^{-1}$. This operator is defined in the full Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ and is of the form $\Theta_S \otimes \Theta_B$. The unitary evolution U depends on the time dependence of the system Hamiltonian, but as we mentioned it can be constant in time, and on the time dependence of the coupling that at least is switched on and off. This time dependence is referred to as the protocol. If one performs the protocol in the time inverted sequence, i.e., one considers $\{H_S(\tau - t), V(\tau - t)\}$ the unitary dynamics will be called $\tilde{U}$. The micro-reversibility principle for non-autonomous systems [21, 27] relates the forward and backward dynamics by $\Theta^\dagger \tilde{U} \Theta = U^\dagger$. Thus if the unitary operator maps $|\phi\rangle$ to $|\phi'\rangle$, i.e., $|\phi'\rangle = U|\phi\rangle$, the time reversed state $\Theta|\phi'\rangle$ is mapped to the time reversed state $\Theta|\phi\rangle$ by the time reversed unitary $\tilde{U}$. We denote reverse states as $|\tilde{\cdot}\rangle = \Theta|\cdot\rangle$. We remark that the anti-linearity of Θ implies that $\langle\tilde{\cdot}| = \langle\Theta\,\cdot| \neq \langle\cdot|\,\Theta^\dagger$.

For the time reversed dynamics consider the initial state $\tilde{\rho}_S = \sum \tilde{p}_f(m)|\tilde{b}_m\rangle\langle\tilde{b}_m|$ which is chosen arbitrarily for the system and thermal for the bath $\tilde{\rho}_B = \sum \frac{e^{-\beta\varepsilon_j}}{Z_B}|\tilde{j}\rangle\langle\tilde{j}|$. Then, for the system the corresponding time reversed map $\tilde{\rho}'_S = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\tilde{\rho}_S)$ has the representation $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\cdot) = \sum_{ij} \tilde{M}_{ji} \cdot \tilde{M}^\dagger_{ji}$ in terms of reversed Kraus operators

$$\tilde{M}_{ji} = \sqrt{\frac{e^{-\beta\varepsilon_j}}{Z_B}}\langle\tilde{i}|\tilde{U}|\tilde{j}\rangle. \tag{19}$$

Micro-reversibility implies that they satisfy (see Appendix A)

$$\tilde{M}_{ji} = \Theta_S \sqrt{e^{\beta(\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j)}} M^\dagger_{ij} \Theta^\dagger_S. \tag{20}$$

We can now relate the probability $p(\gamma) = |\langle b_m|M_{k=ij}|a_n\rangle|^2 p_i(n)$ for a trajectory $\gamma = \{n, k, m\} = \{n, i; m, j\}$ to the probability $\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma}) = |\langle\tilde{a}_n|\tilde{M}_{k=ji}|\tilde{b}_m\rangle|^2 \tilde{p}_f(m)$ of its time reversal $\tilde{\gamma} = \{\tilde{m}, \tilde{k}, \tilde{n}\} = \{\tilde{m}, \tilde{j}; \tilde{n}, \tilde{i}\}$. From Eq.(20) we have $\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma}) = e^{\beta(\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j)}|\langle a_n|M^\dagger_{k=ij}|b_m\rangle|^2 \tilde{p}_f(m)$ and therefore

$$\frac{p(\gamma)}{\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma})} = e^{-\beta(\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j)} \frac{p_i(n)}{\tilde{p}_f(m)}. \tag{21}$$

If the initial state of the backward process $\tilde{p}_f(m)$ is the final state of the forward process, i.e., $\tilde{p}_f(m) = p_f(m)$ we have $p(\gamma) = e^{\Delta_i s_\gamma}\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$. Using this equality we now evaluate

$$p(\Delta_i s) = \sum_\gamma p(\gamma)\delta(\Delta_i s - \Delta_i s_\gamma) = e^{\Delta_i s}\sum_{\tilde{\gamma}} \tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma})\delta(\Delta_i s + \Delta_i s_{\tilde{\gamma}}) = e^{\Delta_i s}\tilde{p}(-\Delta_i s)$$

where we have also used $\Delta_i s_{\tilde{\gamma}} = -\Delta_i s_\gamma$, see Eq.(11).

If the reversed process is identical to the forward process, $\tilde{p}(\Delta_i s) = p(\Delta_i s)$ the fluctuation theorem for the entropy production, Eq.(18), can be written just with the distribution of the forward process, $p(\Delta_i s) = e^{\Delta_i s}p(-\Delta_i s)$. This is the case in the systems we consider if the driving is time symmetric, $\{H_S(t), V(t)\} = \{H_S(\tau - t), V(\tau - t)\}$ for $0 \leq t < \tau$. A constant H_S and (step) V fulfills this condition. Also it is necessary that the operator that is measured is invariant under the time reversal transformation, guaranteeing a one-to-one correspondence between the forward and backward trajectories, in which there is the same trajectory present in both processes. See Appendix B.

The detailed fluctuation theorem for the entropy production implies the integral fluctuation theorem $\langle e^{-\Delta_i s}\rangle = 1$. This in turns implies that if the average entropy production $\Delta_i S = \langle \Delta_i s\rangle = 0$ vanishes, then $\langle e^{-\Delta_i s}\rangle = e^{\langle -\Delta_i s\rangle}$ and due to the convexity of the exponential this is possible only if $p(\Delta_i s) = \delta(\Delta_i s)$, i.e., the stochastic entropy production does not fluctuate. This was already noticed when we discussed maps with equilibrium states and the fluctuation properties in these states. On the other hand, it implies the opposite for *non-equilibrium* steady state, that is, fluctuations of the stochastic entropy production are necessary to have a positive average entropy production $\Delta_i S = \langle \Delta_i s\rangle > 0$.

E. Fluctuations of work

Consider now the case where the initial states of the forward and backward processes are canonical, $p_i(n) = e^{-\beta\epsilon_n}/Z_S$ and $\tilde{p}_f(m) = e^{-\beta\epsilon_m}/Z_S$, then Eq.(21) gives $\frac{p(\gamma)}{\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma})} = e^{-\beta(\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j)}e^{-\beta(\epsilon_n - \epsilon_m)} = e^{\beta w_\gamma}$. One can prove that, if the reversed process is identical to the forward process (see Appendix B), the probability of performing a work w between the initial time with the system in the state $e^{-\beta H_S}/Z_S$ and an arbitrary time (possible after infinite time, when the system reaches the steady state) at which the energy of the system is measured satisfies the fluctuation relation

$$p(w) = p(-w)e^{\beta w}. \tag{22}$$

If instead, the reversed process is not the same as the forward process, the work fluctuation theorem reads $p(w) = \tilde{p}(-w)e^{\beta w}$. For thermal maps, whose stationary state is the canonical thermal state, we saw that $p(w) = \delta(w)$ and thus Eq.(22) is trivially satisfied. For other maps the canonical thermal state is not necessarily invariant. Thus one can consider the evolution of the system initially prepared in the canonical thermal state towards it's steady state and perform the two-point measurement of the system Hamiltonian to find that the work statistics follows Eq.(22). We illustrate later this equality in two interesting situations, a system that undergoes a cyclic process and a system in a non-equilibrium steady state.

F. Generalization to concatenated CPTP maps and applications

In the previous section we have considered that the process $\rho_S \to \rho'_S$ is given by a single CPTP map $\rho'_S = \mathcal{E}(\rho_S) = \sum_k M_k \rho_S M_k^\dagger$ with a particular choice for the Kraus operators M_k that allows a thermodynamic interpretation. We will show that the results of the previous section II can be extended to concatenations of maps, providing a richer setup for the study of thermodynamic processes.

One can concatenate CPTP maps acting over a system to describe a sequence of coupled evolution of a system to a heat bath for given lapses of time. We generalize the concept of quantum trajectory to concatenations of N maps $\mathcal{E}(\cdot) = \mathcal{E}^{(N)}\cdots\mathcal{E}^{(1)}(\cdot)$. Each

$$\mathcal{E}^{(n)}(\cdot) = \sum_k M_k^{(n)}\cdot M_k^{(n)\dagger} \tag{23}$$

is a CPTP map and for each we measure a corresponding k_n associated to the process $|i_n\rangle \to |j_n\rangle$ between eigenstates of the bath. Note that with each map $\mathcal{E}^{(n)}$ a new fresh bath is brought to interaction with the system. Fig. 1 provides an scheme. For instance, as before we consider the unitary evolution operator $U_n = e^{-i\tau_n(H_S + H_b^n + V^n)}$ with V^n representing the energy coupling between the system and the nth copy of the bath (with Hamiltonian H_b^n) in

the time interval $[\sum_{l<n}\tau_l, \sum_{l\leq n}\tau_l]$. We consider V^n constant in this time interval and $V^n = 0$ outside. The Kraus operators are

$$M^n_{ij} = \sqrt{\frac{e^{-\beta\varepsilon_{i_n}}}{Z_b}}\langle j_n|U_n|i_n\rangle, \tag{24}$$

where $\{\varepsilon_{i_n}, |i_n\rangle\}$ is the spectrum of H^n_b and $Z_b = \mathrm{Tr}\, e^{-\beta H^n_b}$. The stochastic heat flow from the bath to the system is given by minus the energy change of the baths $q_\gamma = \sum_n(\varepsilon_{i_n} - \varepsilon_{j_n})$.

As before, we perform a measurement of a system operator A at the beginning and another B at the end of the process. The trajectory is $\gamma = \{n, k_1, \ldots, k_N, m\}$ and its probability $p(\gamma) = p(m, k_1, \ldots, k_N|n)p_i(n)$ is

$$p(\gamma) = |\langle b_m|M^{(N)}_{k_N}\cdots M^{(1)}_{k_1}|a_n\rangle|^2 p_i(n) \tag{25}$$

or explicitly in terms of Eq.(23) and Eq.(24) the probability of a trajectory $\gamma = \{a_n; i_1, j_1; \ldots; i_N, j_N; b_m\}$ is

$$p(\gamma) = |\langle b_m, j_1\cdots j_N|U_N\cdots U_1|i_1\cdots i_N, a_n\rangle|^2 \frac{e^{-\beta\sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_{i_n}}}{Z_b^N} p_i(n) \tag{26}$$

With this, the detailed fluctuation theorem can be extended to concatenations of maps. If in the forward process the sequence $\mathcal{E}^{(N)}\cdots\mathcal{E}^{(1)}$ acts on an initial state, the backward process is the reversed concatenation of the reversed maps, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(1)}\cdots\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}$, and for a given trajectory $\gamma = \{n, k_1\cdots k_N, m\}$ the corresponding backward trajectory is $\tilde{\gamma} = \{\tilde{m}, \tilde{k}_N\cdots\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{n}\}$. The probability of the forward path is given by Eq.(25) while for the backward path is

$$\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma}) = |\langle\tilde{a}_n|\tilde{M}^{(1)}_{k_1}\cdots\tilde{M}^{(N)}_{k_N}|\tilde{b}_m\rangle|^2\tilde{p}_f(m) \tag{27}$$

Because every Kraus operator involved in Eq.(27) satisfies Eq.(20) one gets

$$\frac{p(\gamma)}{\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma})} = e^{-\beta q_\gamma}\frac{p_i(n)}{\tilde{p}_f(m)} \tag{28}$$

and as before, considering the initial state of the backward process $\tilde{p}_f(m)$ as the final state of the forward process, i.e., $\tilde{p}_f(m) = p_f(m)$ we have $p(\gamma) = e^{\Delta_i s_\gamma}\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$. Finally, if the initial states of the forward and backward processes are canonical, $p_i(n) = e^{-\beta\epsilon_n}/Z_S$ and $\tilde{p}_f(m) = e^{-\beta\epsilon_m}/Z_S$, then Eq.(28) gives $\frac{p(\gamma)}{\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma})} = e^{-\beta q_\gamma}e^{-\beta(\epsilon_n-\epsilon_m)} = e^{\beta w_\gamma}$.

Note that for every iteration of the map there is certain amount of average work, heat and entropy production. These quantities are additive. This means that if we know the average work, heat and/or entropy production for two maps that are composed, the average work, heat and/or entropy production for the total map (the composition) is the sum of the corresponding quantity for each map. For fluctuations this separation is not possible.



FIG. 1: The figure depict the first two interactions between the system and the copies of the bath.

G. a thermodynamic cycle

We can illustrate the advantage of considering concatenations of maps by studying a simple thermodynamic cycle. A system starts in the canonical thermal state $\omega_\beta(H_S)$ and then it is driven by a map such as those considered in Sec.

II where work is performed on the system leaving it in a non-equilibrium state ρ'_S but with the same Hamiltonian H_S. Then we assume that a thermal map brings the system back to the thermal state $\omega_\beta(H_S)$. For such a cycle we have that

$$\Delta E = 0 = W_d + Q_d + Q_r$$

where Q_d and W_d refer respectively to the heat exchanged with the bath, Eq.(9), and the work performed on the system, Eq.(10), during the driving process $\omega_\beta(H_S) \to \rho'_S$ and Q_r is the heat exchanged during the final relaxation process $\rho'_S \to \omega_\beta(H_S)$. Since this is achieved with a thermal map one has $W_r = 0$ and thus $Q_r = \mathrm{Tr}[H_S(\omega_\beta(H_S) - \rho'_S)]$. Also one can check that

$$\Delta S = 0 = \Delta_i S_d + \Delta_i S_r + \beta(Q_d + Q_r)$$

where according to Eq.(14) and Eq.(17), $\Delta_i S_d = D(\rho'_{\mathrm{tot}} || \rho'_S \otimes \omega_\beta(H_B))$ and $\Delta_i S_r = D(\rho'_S || \omega_\beta(H_S))$, respectively. It also follows that the total entropy production $\Delta_i S_d + \Delta_i S_r = \beta W_d$ is the dissipated work as expected for a isothermal process starting and finishing in equilibrium. We also get $\Delta_i S_d = -D(\rho'_S || \omega_\beta(H_S)) + \beta W_d$ [33].

Now we consider fluctuations. Note that because the initial and final density matrices are Gibbsian, work and entropy production fluctuations are the same,

$$\ln \frac{p(\gamma)}{\tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma})} = \Delta_i s_\gamma = \Delta s_\gamma - \beta(q^d_\gamma + q^r_\gamma) = \beta \Delta \epsilon_\gamma - \beta(q^d_\gamma + q^r_\gamma) = \beta w_\gamma. \tag{29}$$

In the last equation, $q^{d,r}_\gamma$ are the driving and relaxation stochastic heat, respectively.

Usually, the thermal state is achieved asymptotically when a system interacts with a large memoryless heat bath. This thermalization might also be achieved by concatenating (in theory) an infinite sequence of thermal maps, taking the limit $N \to \infty$ in the process described with Eqs.(23 and 24). This composition is also a thermal map. In the first example of the next section we show that in practice, this can be done much quicker with just a few maps when the system is small.

III. EXAMPLES

A. single spin in a cycle

Consider a single spin with $H_S = (h/2)\sigma^z_S$, that interacts with thermal spins $\omega_\beta(H^n_b)$, with $H^n_b = (h/2)\sigma^z_b$. Here $\sigma^{x,y,z}_{S,b}$ are the Pauli spin 1/2 operators of the system and bath. The interaction V^1 with the first spin is such that $[H_S + H^1_b, V^1] \neq 0$ and thus if the system spin starts in equilibrium, $\rho_S = \omega_\beta(H_S)$, the interaction with the first spin drives the system out of equilibrium to a state $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}(\omega_\beta(H_S))$. Then for the subsequent interactions we take V^n such that $[H_S + H^n_b, V^n] = 0$ with $n \geq 2$ and thus the corresponding $\{\mathcal{E}^{(n)}\}_{n\geq 2}$ are thermal maps that will bring the system back to the thermal $\omega_\beta(H_S)$ state. This constitutes a thermodynamic cycle for the system with a unitary evolution for the spin plus baths total system. As a consequence, the micro-reversibility principle is valid and Eq.(29) is fulfilled (see the next example for details on the time reversal operator). In the left panel of Fig. 2 we plot the (Hilbert-Schmidt) distance between the state of the system at each step of the concatenation and the thermal state and observe that indeed as N grows thermalization becomes more effective. In the right panel we show work and entropy production probability distributions for the cycle considering that at $N = 7$ thermalization has been achieved $||\rho'_S - \omega_\beta(H_S)||_{HS} < 10^{-5}$. We show in Appendix C that thermal maps do not contribute to work fluctuations, thus we plot work fluctuations of the driving part alone as well as of the full cycle, $p_1 \equiv p_{\mathrm{cycle}}(\beta w) = p_{\mathrm{drive}}(\beta w) = p_{\mathrm{cycle}}(\Delta_i s)$. Note that this does not apply for entropy production, $p_2 \equiv p_{\mathrm{drive}}(\Delta_i s) \neq p_1$.



FIG. 2: Left panel) Hilbert-Schmidt distance between the state of the system at each step of the concatenation and the thermal state. In this concatenation process we take $\tau_1 = 1$, $V^1 = (J_B + 0.3)\sigma_b^x\sigma_S^x + J_B\sigma_b^y\sigma_S^y$, $\tau_n = 4, V^n = J_B\sigma_b^x\sigma_S^x + J_B\sigma_b^y\sigma_S^y$ for $n \geq 2$ and the other parameters are $h = 1$, $J_B = 3$, and $\beta = 1$. Right panel) Work and entropy production distributions for the full cycle and the driving alone, $p_1 \equiv p_{\rm drive}(\beta w) = p_{\rm cycle}(\beta w) = p_{\rm cycle}(\Delta_i s) \neq p_2 \equiv p_{\rm drive}(\Delta_i s)$. The parameters for the plot are the same as in the left panel.

B. Spin 1/2 chains

Let us consider a one-dimensional spin 1/2 chain $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdots \vec{\sigma}_N$ with Hamiltonian H_S interacting through the first site with a spin 1/2 particle with Hamiltonian $H_b = \frac{h}{2}\sigma_b^z$ in a thermal state, where the interaction is given by

$$V = J_B(\sigma_b^x\sigma_1^x + \sigma_b^y\sigma_1^y). \tag{30}$$

Here the Pauli operators $\sigma_b^{x,y,z}$ belong to the single bath spin and $\sigma_1^{x,y,z}$ to the first spin of the chain. The unitary evolution for the system plus bath is given by the operator $U = e^{-i\tau(H_S+H_b+V)}$. Micro-reversibility holds if there exist an anti-unitary operator Θ such that $\Theta\tilde{U}\Theta^\dagger = U^\dagger$. For the spin systems we consider below $\Theta = i\sigma_b^x i\sigma_b^y \Pi_{i=1}^N (i\sigma_n^x i\sigma_n^y)K$ is a time reversal symmetry operator where K performs the complex conjugation. Note that usually when a system involves a magnetic field one needs to invert the direction of the magnetic field and thus the detailed fluctuation theorem in that case will relate the fluctuations of two different systems. However, for the time reversal operator we consider here that is not the case [34]. The factor $i\sigma^x$ rotates the system in 180° in the x direction, leaving the σ^z terms invariant (see below the Hamiltonians). Replacing H_b in Eq.(3) one obtain four Kraus operators M_{ij} with $i, j = \pm$, corresponding to transitions in the bath when $i \neq j$.

Let now the system be an XX spin 1/2 chain with Hamiltonian

$$H_{XX} = \frac{h}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sigma_i^z - \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} J_i^x(\sigma_i^x\sigma_{i+1}^x + \sigma_i^y\sigma_{i+1}^y).$$

The total magnetization is a conserved quantity for the XX spin chain, i.e., $[H_{XX}, H_0] = 0$, with $H_0 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^M h_i\sigma_i^z$ the non-interacting part of the Hamiltonian. Considering the Hamiltonian of the bath H_b and the interaction between the chain and the bath V one finds that the unitary evolution $U = e^{-i\tau(H_{XX}+H_b+V)}$ satisfies $[U, H_0 + H_b] = 0$, thus $\omega_\beta(H_0)$ is an equilibrium state of the non-thermal map with equilibrium $\mathcal{E}$. In this example the Hamiltonian is of the form $H_S = H_0 + H_I$ with $[H_0, H_I] = 0$. The stochastic thermodynamics for such a system was discussed in section II B. We can see that iterating the map as discussed in section II F, an initial state $\rho_S(0)$ converges to the equilibrium state $\omega_\beta(H_0)$. This is illustrated in Fig. 3. The (cumulated) average work performed on that process is given by Eq.(16) and because $\mathrm{Tr}_S[H_I\omega_\beta(H_0)] = 0$ in this example it is simply given by $W = -\mathrm{Tr}_S[H_I\rho_S(0)]$, the (cumulated) heat is $Q = \mathrm{Tr}_S[H_0(\omega_\beta(H_0) - \rho_S(0))]$ and the (cumulated) entropy production is $\Delta_i S = D(\rho_S(0)||\omega_\beta(H_0))$. The asymptotic values are indicated in Fig. 3, left panel. Concerning the fluctuating properties we showed in II B that in the equilibrium state $\omega_\beta(H_0)$ the entropy production does not fluctuate but work may fluctuate. This is illustrated in Fig. 4, left panel.

Let us now consider the XY spin 1/2 chain with Hamiltonian

$$H_{XY} = \frac{h}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sigma_i^z - \sum_{i=1}^{M-1}(J_i^x\sigma_i^x\sigma_{i+1}^x + J_i^y\sigma_i^y\sigma_{i+1}^y).$$

coupled to the bath with Hamiltonian H_b through the same coupling V. For this system the invariant state ρ_{XY} of the map $\mathcal{E}$ is not related to any operator H_0 such that $[U, H_0 + H_b] = 0$. Indeed, the state $\rho_{XY} \otimes \omega_\beta(H_b)$ is not invariant under the unitary evolution and this indicates already that the steady state ρ_{XY} is a NESS. We can see that iterating the map for the XY chain a steady state is reached where a constant amount of work is being performed each time the map is applied and the same for the heat and entropy production. This is illustrated by the constant slopes in the cumulated thermodynamic quantities in Fig. 3, right panel. These slopes can be computed but not in terms of the system properties only, they are global quantities. For instance the slope for the entropy production is $D(U\rho_{XY} \otimes \omega_\beta(H_b)U^\dagger || \rho_{XY} \otimes \omega_\beta(H_b))$. In this case the map on the XY spin chain is a map with NESS.

Finally, let us consider some fluctuation properties. In the left panel of Fig. 4 we plot the work distribution for the XX spin 1/2 chain in the equilibrium state, where $p(\Delta_i s) = \delta(\Delta_i s)$, but as noted before the work fluctuates, i.e., $p(w) \neq \delta(w)$, but $\langle w \rangle = 0$. The work fluctuation relation Eq.(22) is illustrated in the right panel of Fig. 4 for the XY spin chain.



FIG. 3: Left panel) For the homogeneous XX spin 1/2 chain with three sites, cumulated average work (dashed-black), heat (dashed-red) and entropy production (dashed-blue) as a function of the iteration number. The corresponding straight lines are the theoretically computed asymptotic values. Right panel) The same quantities for the homogeneous XY spin 1/2 chain with three sites. In both cases the initial density matrix is the Gibbs state $\omega_\beta(H_S)$, which is a non-equilibrium state. The parameters for the plots are: $h = 2$, $J_i^x = J_B = 3$, $\beta = 1.2$ and $\tau = 1$, and $J_i^y = 2$ in the right panel.



FIG. 4: Left panel) Work distribution for the XX spin 1/2 chain in the equilibrium state. Right panel) Work fluctuation relation Eq.(22) for the XY spin 1/2 chain, starting from the Gibbs state in the forward and backward processes. In both plots we have used a chain of two sites and one map. The parameters for the plots are: $h = 2$, $J_i^x = J_B = 3$, $\beta = 1.2$ and $\tau = 1$, and $J_i^y = 2$ in the right panel.

IV. CONCLUSION

We have studied the stochastic thermodynamics of CPTP quantum maps discussing in particular the properties of maps with equilibrium. Thermal maps are a very important class of maps with equilibrium because they represent the

passive effect of a heat bath on a system, while non-thermal maps with equilibrium require the active intervention of an agent, manifested by the work required to perform the process represented by $\mathcal{E}$ even when the system Hamiltonian is not-driven.

Non-thermal maps with equilibrium are, in a sense, in between thermal maps and maps with non-equilibrium steady states. They share the simplicity of thermal maps of relaxing to the equilibrium state, while allowing us to study energy exchanges between the system, the bath and the experimenter in a non-trivial case. The result we have illustrated here is not restricted to quantum systems, but in quantum systems the manipulation of the interaction with the environment is much better controlled and thus the possibility of transforming the state of a system using *active* interactions $V(t)$ with the environment as illustrated with the XX spin 1/2 chain is already in the tool box of the experimentalist [4]. We believe that an implementation of the XX chain with trapped ions is possible and that it can be a candidate to investigate further aspects of quantum thermodynamics.

Stochastic thermodynamics for classical systems with Hamiltonian or stochastic dynamics (Langevin or discrete master equation) is usually formulated for systems with the properties we associate to thermal operations: in the absence of driving the system thermalizes to the corresponding Gibbs state and the stochastic work is zero in non-driven systems. For instance, in classical stochastic thermodynamics, and for thermal maps too, a system in equilibrium presents no entropy production fluctuation and this implies no work fluctuations either. In the quantum case one can consider these fluctuations simultaneously if the equilibrium state commutes with the Hamiltonian of the system. We have seen that in the XX spin 1/2 chain we have studied, where the dynamics is controlled by a non-thermal map with equilibrium, and where the equilibrium state commutes with the Hamiltonian, it is possible to have a fluctuating work and no entropy production fluctuations.

On the other hand, open systems, in contact with a single heat bath, whose dynamics is represented by a map without equilibrium (its invariant state is a non-equilibrium state), presents a complexity similar to the one of open systems passively coupled to two heat baths. Nevertheless a few properties for this case were also studied like the statistic of work for systems starting in the Gibbs $\omega_\beta(H_S)$ state, Eq.(22).

As a final remark, we would like to point out, that when we iterate CPTP maps and we take the limit $\tau \to 0$ and the coupling strength scaling like $\tau^{-1/2}$, the system dynamics is described by a Lindblad equation. The thermodynamic properties in these systems were studied in [35]. One can notice that even-though the map that one is using to concatenate does not have an equilibrium state, in the limit $\tau \to 0$ it can be written as a composition of maps where each has an equilibrium state. We hope to report in a future publication the important role of CPTP maps with equilibrium for non-equilibrium systems described by Lindblad dynamics.

Acknowledgements

F.B. gratefully acknowledges the financial support of FONDECYT grant 1151390. C.L. gratefully acknowledges the financial support of CONICYT through Becas Magister Nacional 2016, Contract No. 22161809.

Appendices

A. PROOF OF EQ.(20)

Eq.(20) is an equality between operators in the system Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_S$ that we can write as

$$\langle\tilde{i}|\,\tilde{U}\,|\tilde{j}\rangle = \Theta_S\,\langle j|\,U\,|i\rangle^\dagger\,\Theta_S^\dagger$$

where $\tilde{U} = \Theta U^\dagger \Theta^\dagger$ and $|\tilde{i}\rangle = \Theta_B\,|i\rangle$. We prove it by showing that the matrix elements in an arbitrary basis are the same. Consider the operator at the left hand side and evaluate its matrix elements with states $|\tilde{a}\rangle = \Theta_S\,|a\rangle$ and $|\tilde{b}\rangle = \Theta_S\,|b\rangle$, i.e.,

$$\left(|\tilde{a}\rangle\,,\langle\tilde{i}|\,\tilde{U}\,|\tilde{j}\rangle\,|\tilde{b}\rangle\right)_{\mathcal{H}_S} = \left(|\tilde{a}\tilde{i}\rangle\,,\tilde{U}\,|\tilde{b}\tilde{j}\rangle\right)_{\mathcal{H}_{\rm tot}} = \left(\Theta\,|ai\rangle\,,\Theta U^\dagger\,|bj\rangle\right)_{\mathcal{H}_{\rm tot}} = \left(U^\dagger\,|bj\rangle\,,|ai\rangle\right)_{\mathcal{H}_{\rm tot}} = \langle bj|\,U\,|ai\rangle\,.$$

Let us know evaluate the same element for the operator in the right hand side

$$\left(|\tilde{a}\rangle\,,\Theta_S\,\langle j|\,U\,|i\rangle^\dagger\,\Theta_S^\dagger\,|\tilde{b}\rangle\right)_{\mathcal{H}_S} = \left(\Theta_S\,|a\rangle\,,\Theta_S\,\langle j|\,U\,|i\rangle^\dagger\,|b\rangle\right)_{\mathcal{H}_S} = \left(\langle j|\,U\,|i\rangle^\dagger\,|b\rangle\,,|a\rangle\right)_{\mathcal{H}_S} = \left(|b\rangle\,,\langle j|\,U\,|i\rangle\,|a\rangle\right)_{\mathcal{H}_S} = \langle bj|\,U\,|ai\rangle$$

and therefore we have the equality. Note that we have used the property $(\Theta\phi,\Theta\psi) = (\psi,\phi)$ that the anti-unitary operators Θ and Θ_S satisfy in the corresponding Hilbert space.

B. $p(w) = \tilde{p}(w)$ IF THE HAMILTONIAN H_{tot} IS INVARIANT UNDER TIME REVERSAL.

For the spin systems we consider in our analysis and the time reversal operator Θ defined in Section III, we have the equality $\tilde{U} = U$, which equivalently means that the Hamiltonian H_{tot} is invariant under time reversal. We will now show that this implies that the work distribution of the forward process equals the work distribution of the reversed process, $p(w) = \tilde{p}(w)$. For every trajectory $\gamma = \{n, k, m\}$ in the forward process there is a a associated backward trajectory $\tilde{\gamma} = \{\tilde{m}, \tilde{k}, \tilde{n}\}$, but now we will compare γ with another trajectory belonging to the backward trajectories, that is $\tilde{\gamma}' = \{\tilde{n}, -\tilde{k}, \tilde{m}\}$ where if $k = ij$ is associated with the Kraus operator $M_{k=ij}$, then $-\tilde{k}$ corresponds to the operator $\tilde{M}_{ij}$ (see Eq.(19)). Note that if we measure the system energy at the beginning and at the end, $|a_n\rangle$ and $|b_m\rangle$ correspond to energy eigenstates. Due to the fact that the Hamiltonian is invariant under time reversal, we have that $\Theta_S |a_n\rangle = |a_n\rangle$ and $\Theta_S |b_m\rangle = |b_m\rangle$ (the same is true for the energy eigenstates of the bath, $\Theta_B |i\rangle = |i\rangle$ and $\Theta_B |j\rangle = |j\rangle$), thus according to Eq.(19) we get $\tilde{M}_{ij} = M_{ij}$. These trajectories are:

$$|n\rangle \xrightarrow{k} |m\rangle\,, \quad p(\gamma) = p_i(n) \left|\langle b_m| M_{ij} |a_n\rangle\right|^2, \quad \beta w_\gamma = \ln \frac{p_i(n)}{p_i(m)} - \beta(\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j) \tag{31}$$

$$|\tilde{n}\rangle \xrightarrow{-\tilde{k}} |\tilde{m}\rangle\,, \quad \tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma}') = p_i(n) \left|\langle \tilde{b}_m| \tilde{M}_{ij} |\tilde{a}_n\rangle\right|^2, \quad \beta w_{\tilde{\gamma}'} = \ln \frac{p_i(n)}{p_i(m)} - \beta(\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j). \tag{32}$$

Those two probabilities are the same, $p(\gamma) = \tilde{p}(\tilde{\gamma}')$ and $w_\gamma = w_{\tilde{\gamma}'}$. We conclude that every trajectory in the forward process is also present in the backward process, so the work distribution is the same, $p(w) = \tilde{p}(w)$.

To derive an equivalent relation for the entropy production, $p(\Delta_i s) = \tilde{p}(\Delta_i s)$, we equivalently require that $\Theta |a_n\rangle = |a_n\rangle$ and $\Theta |b_m\rangle = |b_m\rangle$, however, now these states are the initial density matrix and final density matrix eigenstates. We thus need time reversal invariant initial and final density matrices, i.e., $\Theta\rho\Theta^\dagger = \rho$ and $\Theta\rho'\Theta^\dagger = \rho'$. In the stationary state of the XX spin chain this is fulfilled, since $\rho_{XX} = e^{-\beta H_0}/Z_0$ is invariant under time reversal with Θ defined as in Section III. However, for the XY stationary state, this is not true, since $\rho_{XY} \neq \Theta\rho_{XY}\Theta^\dagger$.

The previous analysis can be readily generalized to a concatenation of maps and the same results hold.

C. THERMAL MAPS DO NOT CONTRIBUTE TO WORK FLUCTUATIONS

To demonstrate that in the thermodynamic cycle of section II G the work probability distribution is determined only by the driving, $p_{\mathrm{cycle}}(w) = p_{\mathrm{drive}}(w)$, we assume that there is just one thermalization map. The generalization to many thermalization maps, though, is straight forward.

The work distribution probability is

$$\begin{aligned} p(w) &= \sum_\gamma p(\gamma)\, \delta(\epsilon_m - \epsilon_n - q_\gamma - w) \\ &= \sum_\gamma p_i(n) p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \,|\, \langle \epsilon_m, \varepsilon_{j_1}, \varepsilon_{j_2}| \, U_2 U_1 \, |\epsilon_n, \varepsilon_{i_1}, \varepsilon_{i_2}\rangle \,|^2\, \delta(\epsilon_m - \epsilon_n - q_\gamma - w), \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where U_1 is responsible for the driving and U_2 for the thermalization. The probabilities are $p_i(n) = e^{-\beta\epsilon_n}/Z_S$ and $p_{i_k} = e^{-\beta\varepsilon_{i_k}}/Z_b$, and $\delta(\cdot)$ is a Kronecker-Delta. Expanding the transition probability and including two identities in the system Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_S$ we get

$$p(w) = \sum_{\gamma,\alpha,\beta} p_i(n) p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \,|\, \langle \epsilon_m, \varepsilon_{j_2}| \, U_2 \, |\epsilon_\alpha, \varepsilon_{i_2}\rangle \, \langle \epsilon_\alpha, \varepsilon_{j_1}| \, U_1 \, |\epsilon_n, \varepsilon_{i_1}\rangle \, \langle \epsilon_n, \varepsilon_{i_1}| \, U_1^\dagger \, |\epsilon_\beta, \varepsilon_{j_1}\rangle \, \langle \epsilon_\beta, \varepsilon_{i_2}| \, U_2^\dagger \, |\epsilon_m, \varepsilon_{j_2}\rangle \; \delta(\epsilon_m - \epsilon_n - q_\gamma - w).$$

Since U_2 is thermal, $\epsilon_m + \varepsilon_{j_2} = \epsilon_\alpha + \varepsilon_{i_2} = \epsilon_\beta + \varepsilon_{i_2}$, thus, since the system Hamiltonian is non-degenerate, $\alpha = \beta$. Additionally, we can replace $\epsilon_m = \epsilon_\alpha + \varepsilon_{i_2} - \varepsilon_{j_2}$ in the delta, obtaining

$$p(w) = \sum_{\gamma,\alpha} p_i(n) p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \,|\, \langle \epsilon_\alpha, \varepsilon_{j_1}| \, U_1 \, |\epsilon_n, \varepsilon_{i_1}\rangle \,|^2 \,|\, \langle \epsilon_m, \varepsilon_{j_2}| \, U_2 \, |\epsilon_\alpha, \varepsilon_{i_2}\rangle \,|^2 \delta(\epsilon_\alpha - \epsilon_n + \varepsilon_{j_1} - \varepsilon_{i_1} - w). \tag{34}$$

Summing over m and j_2 the second transition probability becomes a trace, which is equal to one. Finally we arrive to

$$p(w) = \sum_{\alpha, j_1, n, i_1} p_i(n) p_{i_1} \,|\, \langle \epsilon_\alpha, \varepsilon_{j_1}| \, U_1 \, |\epsilon_n, \varepsilon_{i_1}\rangle \,|^2 \delta(\epsilon_\alpha - \epsilon_n + \varepsilon_{j_1} - \varepsilon_{j_2} - w). \tag{35}$$

Note that this quantity is exactly the work distribution probability of the driving alone, thus $p_{\rm cycle}(w) = p_{\rm drive}(w)$. We remark that this implies also that $p_{\rm cycle}(w) = \tilde{p}_{\rm cycle}(w)$ despite of the fact that the protocol is not symmetric (because in the backward process the relaxation map acts first).

---

[1] R. Uzdin, A. Levy, and R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 031044 (2015).
[2] R. Kosloff and A. Levy, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **65**, 365 (2014).
[3] K. Brandner and U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. E **93**, 062134 (2016).
[4] P. Schindler, et al. Nature Physics **9**, 361 (2013).
[5] G. Manzano, J. M. Horowitz and J. M. R. Parrondo, Phys. Rev. E **95** 032129 (2015).
[6] U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 020601 (2016).
[7] C. Jarzynski, Phys. Rev. X **7**, 011008 (2017)
[8] T. G. Philbin and J. Anders, J. Phys. A **49**, 215303 (2016).
[9] M. Esposito, K. Lindenberg and C. Van den Broeck, New J. Phys. **12** 013013 (2010).
[10] D. Reeb and M. M. Wolf, New J. Phys. **16**, 103011 (2014).
[11] J. M. Horowitz and J. M. R. Parrondo, New J. Phys. **15**, 085028 (2013).
[12] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford), 2002.
[13] H. Spohn, J. Math. Phys. **19**, 1227 (1978).
[14] H. Spohn and J. L. Lebowitz, Adv. Chem. Phys. **38**, 109 (1978).
[15] R. Alicki, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **12**, L103 (1979).
[16] M. Esposito, U. Harbola and S. Mukamel, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1665 (2009)
[17] D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen, G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2401 (1993); G. Gallavotti and E.G. D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2694 (1995).
[18] J. Kurchan J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **31**, 3719 (1998).
[19] J. L. Lebowitz and H. Sphon, J. Stat. Phys. **95**, 333 (1999).
[20] G. Crooks, J. Stat. Phys. **90**, 1481 (1998); Phys. Rev. E **60**, 2721 (1999).
[21] D. Andrieux and P. Gaspard. Phys. Rev. Lett **100**, 230404 (2008).
[22] U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 040602 (2005).
[23] D. Collin, et al. Nature **437**, 231 (2005).
[24] J. Kurchan, arXiv:cond-mat/0007360v2
[25] H. Tasaki, arXiv:cond-mat/0009244v2
[26] Andrieux, D., P. Gaspard, T. Monnai, and S. Tasaki, New. J. Phys. **11** 043014 (2009).
[27] M. Campisi, P. Hänggi, and P. Talkner, Rev. Mod. Phys., **83**, 771 (2011).
[28] J. M. Horowitz, Quantum-trajectory approach to the stochastic thermodynamics of a forced harmonic oscillator, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 031110 (2012).
[29] D. Jennings, T. Rudolph, Y. Hirono, S. Nakayama, M. Murao Phys. Rev. E 92 (arXiv:1204.3571), 042113
[30] M. Lostaglio, K. Korzekwa, D. Jennings, T. Rudolph, Physical review X 5 (2), 021001
[31] M. Lostaglio, D. Jennings, T. Rudolph Nature communications 6, 6383
[32] P. Faist, J. Oppenheim, R. Renner, New J. Phys. **17** 043003 (2015)
[33] S. Deffner and E. Lutz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 140404 (2011).
[34] F. Haake, *Quantum Signatures of Chaos*, 3rd ed., Springer Series in Synergetics, (Springer, Berlin), 2010.
[35] F. Barra, Sci. Rep. **5** 14873 (2015).